UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/707,965	01/28/2004	Martin Meckesheimer	03-0527	1964

64722 7590 05/14/2007

OSTRAGER CHONG FLAHERTY & BROITMAN, P.C.
570 LEXINGTON AVENUE
FLOOR 17
NEW YORK, NY 10022-6894

EXAMINER	
BODDIE, WILLIAM	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2629	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/14/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/707,965	MECKESHEIMER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	William L. Boddie	2629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 January 2004 is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/19/07.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. In an amendment dated, February 19th, 2007, the Applicants amended claims 1, 7, 14, 17, 20, 22-24, 28, 30 and 32. Currently claims 1-39 are pending.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on February 21st, 2007 was filed after the mailing date of the first Office action on November 27th, 2006. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Drawings

3. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the "at least one coupler" must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

4. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering

of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claim 26 is rejected under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112. Claim 26 recites the limitation "the transmitter" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

7. Claims 1-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Specifically, the newly added limitations to each independent claim describing "at least one coupler" is seen as new matter. The Examiner has considered the

specification and the drawings of the current application but has been unsuccessful in locating enabling discussion for any coupler.

In the Remarks, the Applicants pointed to paragraphs 31 and 38 of the current specification as evidence that the coupler was described in the specification. The Examiner disagrees that these two paragraphs are sufficient discussion to enable the coupler limitation. The pertinent sentence from the paragraphs seems to be:

> The message(s) may be stored into memory while receiving a portion of the signal 50, may be preprogrammed into the memory, or received from a network coupled to it (such as an In-Flight Entertainment System). (para. 31,38)

It should be pointed out that nowhere in this sentence is there any discussion of a "coupler". It is merely mentioned that the network is coupled to "it" ("it' is seen to refer back to either the placard or the memory). As there is no mention of a single "coupler" there is certainly even less enablement for more than one coupler.

Additionally, the Applicants are pointed to the structure of the sentence. There are three ways to acquire messages, storing them in memory while receiving a signal, preprogramming them into memory, **or** receiving them from the network. Most important to note is that these three options are not disclosed as combinable. The use of the word "or" in the sentence does not allow, for instance, the messages to be stored in memory as well as be received from a coupled network. This seems to be in direct contrast to the currently claimed limitations, which require both a wireless receiver and at least one coupler.

Finally as noted above in the objection to the drawings, there is never any depiction of the "at least one coupler" in any of the drawings. As the Examiner has

been unable to find any enabling disclosure for "at least one coupler" the claim limitation is seen as new matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1-8, 17-18 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Albert et al. (US 6,118,426) in view of Weinberger et al. (US 7,028,304).

With respect to claim 1, Albert discloses, a placard (fig. 6b for example) comprising:

a receiver (302 and 360 in fig. 6a) having a memory storing an identification code (360; col. 14, lines 33-37) and an antenna (302 in fig. 6a) for receiving a signal, said signal comprising a first portion for identification and a second portion for a first customer specific message (col. 19, lines 56-58; col. 14, lines 33-41; clearly demonstrate that Albert includes identification data along with a customer specific message in the data transmitted to the placard);

a capacitor (320 in fig. 6a; col. 14, lines 22-24) coupled to the receiver; and

an electronic updateable static display (350 in fig. 6a; col. 14, lines 42-47) coupled to the receiver and powered by the capacitor (col. 14, lines 10-17) for displaying said first customer specific message and any subsequent messages when

said first portion of the signal matches the identification code of the placard (col. 14, lines 37-41), whereby the capacitor is capable of being charged by the signal (col. 14, lines 10-17 for example).

Albert does not expressly disclose, at least one coupler connected to at least one member selected from the group comprising an in-flight entertainment system, an airline reservation system, and an airline boarding system for receiving a second customer specific message therefrom.

Weinberger discloses, an airline passenger entertainment system (fig. 1 for example), comprising:

at least one coupler (235 in fig. 7 for example) connected to at least one member selected from the group comprising an in-flight entertainment system (268 in fig. 5; for example) for receiving a second customer specific message therefrom (clear from figs. 1-7); wherein a display is connected to said at least one coupler (122 in fig. 7 for example).

Albert and Weinberger are analogous art because they are both from the same field of endeavor namely, air travel related display systems (Albert; col. 14, lines 60-61).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the entertainment system coupler of Weinberger in the displays of Albert.

The motivation for doing so would have been to efficiently allow for higher bandwidth applications of the displays, such as teleconferencing or video download (Weinberger; col. 16, lines 5-14).

With respect to claim 2, Albert and Weinberger disclose, the placard according to claim 1 (see above).

Albert further discloses, wherein the identification code of the device is a device descriptive identity (each device is given a unique identification code; this is seen as sufficiently describing the device; also note col. 14, line 36 which discloses the programming of the identification codes similar to cellular phones and beepers).

With respect to claim 3, Albert and Weinberger disclose, the placard according to claim 1 (see above).

Albert further discloses, wherein the identification code of the device is a user selectable identity (col. 14, lines 33-36 discloses the use of user selectable dip switches).

With respect to claim 4, Albert and Weinberger disclose, the placard according to claim 1 (see above).

Albert further discloses, wherein the identification code of the device is a unique identity (col. 14, line 34).

With respect to claim 5, Albert and Weinberger disclose, the placard according to claim 1 (see above).

Albert further discloses, wherein the receiver comprises an RF receiver (clear from fig. 6a).

With respect to claim 6, Albert and Weinberger disclose, the placard according to claim 5 (see above).

Albert further discloses, wherein the RF receiver is an active RF receiver (col. 14, lines 60-66 discloses using internal batteries to power the device; this is the only requirement for an active RF receiver according to para. 11 of the specification).

With respect to claim 7, Albert and Weinberger disclose, the placard according to claim 5 (see above).

Albert further discloses, wherein the RF receiver is a passive RF receiver (310 in fig. 6a; also note col. 14, lines 18-21).

With respect to claim 8, Albert and Weinberger disclose, the placard according to claim 1 (see above).

Albert further discloses, wherein the electronic updateable static display comprises an electronic paper display (col. 14, lines 55-60 for example).

With respect to claim 17, Albert discloses, a system comprising:

one or more antennas (302 in fig. 6a);

a transmitter for transmitting a signal (370 in fig. 6a), said signal comprising a first portion for identification and a second portion for a first customer specific message (col. 19, lines 56-58; col. 14, lines 33-41; clearly demonstrate that Albert includes identification data along with a customer specific message in the data transmitted to the placard); and

a plurality of placards (col. 14, lines 60-64), wherein each placard comprise a receiver having a memory storing an identification code (col. 14, lines 33-36) and an antenna for receiving the signal (302 in fig. 6a); a capacitor coupled to the receiver (320 in fig. 6a; col. 14, lines 21-24); and an electronic updateable static display (350 in fig.

6a; col. 14, lines 42-47) coupled to the receiver and powered by the capacitor for displaying a first customer specific message and any subsequent messages when said first portion of the signal matches the identification code of the placard (col. 14, lines 37-41), whereby the capacitor is capable of being charged by the signal (col. 14, lines 10-17 for example).

Albert does not expressly disclose, at least one coupler connected to at least one member selected from the group comprising an in-flight entertainment system, an airline reservation system, and an airline boarding system for receiving a second customer specific message therefrom.

Weinberger discloses, an airline passenger entertainment system (fig. 1 for example), comprising:

at least one coupler (235 in fig. 7 for example) connected to at least one member selected from the group comprising an in-flight entertainment system (268 in fig. 5; for example) for receiving a second customer specific message therefrom (clear from figs. 1-7); wherein a display is connected to said at least one coupler (122 in fig. 7 for example).

Albert and Weinberger are analogous art because they are both from the same field of endeavor namely, air travel related display systems (Albert; col. 14, lines 60-61).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the entertainment system coupler of Weinberger in the displays of Albert.

The motivation for doing so would have been to efficiently allow for higher bandwidth applications of the displays, such as teleconferencing or video download (Weinberger; col. 16, lines 5-14).

With respect to claim 18, Albert and Weinberger disclose, the system according to claim 17 (see above).

Albert further discloses, a controller coupled to the transmitter for generating the signal (col. 17, lines 12-15; also see col. 17, line 48), wherein the signal comprises one or more identification codes (col. 14, lines 33-38), each identification code being associated with one of the plurality of placards (col. 14, lines 33-35), each identification code having associated with it a customer specific message (col. 14, lines 37-41; the customer specific message being the data stream that is attached to (i.e. "associated with") the id code data).

With respect to claim 32, Albert discloses, a method of using a system comprising:

generating a signal (col. 17, lines 12-15; also see col. 17, line 48) having one or more placard identification codes (col. 14, lines 33-38) and a first customer specific message associated with each of the placard identifications (col. 14, lines 37-41; the customer specific message being the data stream that is attached to (i.e. "associated with") the id code data);

transmitting the signal using a transmitter (370 in fig. 6a) and one or more antennas (note the antenna on the transmitter in fig. 6a);

receiving the signal on an antenna coupled to a receiver (302 in fig. 6a; col. 14, lines 18-20);

charging a capacitor coupled to the receiver on each of the one or more placards using the energy received from the signal (col. 14, lines 18-26); and

displaying the first customer specific message and any subsequent messages on an electronic updateable static display (350 in fig. 6a; col. 14, lines 27-31), which is coupled to the capacitor and the receiver (clear from fig. 6a), by using the energy from the capacitor when a portion of the one or more placard identifications is the placard receiving the signal from a database(col. 14, lines 33-41).

Albert does not expressly disclose, retrieving a second customer specific message through at least one coupler from at least one member selected from the group comprising an in-flight entertainment system, an airline reservation system, and an airline boarding system for receiving a second customer specific message therefrom.

Weinberger discloses, an airline passenger entertainment system (fig. 1 for example), receiving a second customer specific message (clear from figs. 1-7) from at least one coupler (235 in fig. 7 for example) connected to at least one member selected from the group comprising an in-flight entertainment system (268 in fig. 5; for example) for receiving a second customer specific message therefrom (clear from figs. 1-7); wherein a receiver (272 in fig. 7 for example) and the entertainment system (268 in fig. 5) are coupled to said at least one coupler.

Albert and Weinberger are analogous art because they are both from the same field of endeavor namely, air travel related display systems (Albert; col. 14, lines 60-61).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the entertainment system coupler of Weinberger in the displays of Albert.

The motivation for doing so would have been to efficiently allow for higher bandwidth applications of the displays, such as teleconferencing or video download (Weinberger; col. 16, lines 5-14).

10. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Albert et al. (US 6,118,426) in view of Weinberger et al. (US 7,028,304) and further in view of Applicant's admitted prior art (hereinafter APA).

With respect to claim 9, Albert and Weinberger disclose, the placard according to claim 1 (see above).

Neither Weinberger nor Albert expressly disclose, wherein the electronic updateable static display comprises a photonic ink display.

APA discloses the use of a specific type of electronic paper, photonic ink (para. 8).

APA, Weinberger and Albert are analogous art because they are both drawn to the same field of endeavor namely electronic paper types.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use photonic ink, taught by APA, in the electronic paper displays of Albert and Weinberger.

The motivation for doing so would have been the ability of photonic ink to generate any wavelength with simply a difference in voltage applied (APA; bottom of para. 8).

11. Claims 10-14 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Albert et al. (US 6,118,426) in view of Weinberger et al. (US 7,028,304) and further in view of Gelbman (US 6,753,830)

With respect to claim 10, Albert and Weinberger disclose, the placard according to claim 1 (see above).

Neither Weinberger nor Albert expressly disclose, a message memory coupled to a receiver, for storing one or more messages.

Gelbman discloses, electronic ink labels comprising a message memory (28 in fig. 2) coupled to the receiver (22 in fig. 2) for storing one or more messages for displaying upon the electronic updatable static display (abstract; also see col. 5, lines 54-60).

Gelbman, Weinberger and Albert are analogous art because they are both from the same field of endeavor namely wirelessly updateable displays, which operate with power gained from radio communications.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the message memory of Gelbman in the displays of Albert and Weinberger.

The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a series of indicia to be displayed for a finite time period (Gelbman; col. 6, line 64 – col. 7, line 4).

With respect to claim 11, Albert, Weinberger and Gelbman disclose, the placard according to claim 10 (see above).

Gelbman further discloses, a power source (60 for example in fig. 5) for powering the message memory (col. 12, lines 3-9).

With respect to claim 12, Albert and Gelbman disclose, the placard according to claim 11 (see above).

Gelbman further discloses, wherein the power source comprises a solar cell or a battery (col. 12, lines 3-9).

With respect to claim 13, Albert, Weinberger and Gelbman disclose, the placard according to claim 10 (see above).

Gelbman further discloses, a timer (24 in fig. 2) coupled to the message memory for initiating the one or more messages upon the electronic updateable static display (col. 6, line 64 – col. 7, line 4).

With respect to claim 14, Albert, Weinberger and Gelbman disclose, the placard according to claim 10 (see above).

Gelbman further discloses, wherein the power source supplements the capacitor for changing, clearing or resetting the display (col. 12, lines 4-9; specifically note the disclosure concerning a combination of on-board and off-board sources).

With respect to claim 39, Albert and Weinberger disclose, the placard according to claim 1 (see above).

Neither Weinberger nor Albert expressly disclose, a function to set the display with a void, clear, opaque or dark screen.

Gelbman discloses, a function for commanding an electronic updateable static display to be set with a void, clear, opaque or dark screen (col. 18, line 22 for example).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include a function for commanding a blank display screen, as taught by Gelbman, on the displays of Albert and Weinberger.

The motivation for doing so would have been to eliminate the need for manually erasing old information displayed for each item or group of items (Gelbman; col. 18, lines 43-45).

12. Claims 15-16, 24-26, 28-31 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Albert et al. (US 6,118,426) in view of Weinberger et al. (US 7,028,304) and further in view of Ehrenberger et al. (US 5,785,283).

With respect to claim 15, Albert and Weinberger disclose, the placard according to claim 1 (see above).

Neither Weinberger nor Albert expressly disclose, wherein the receiver comprises a transponder.

Ehrenberger discloses wherein a receiver comprises a transponder (note transceiver 146 in fig. 2).

Ehrenberger, Weinberger and Albert are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor namely display systems receiving display data via radio communications.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include transceiver circuitry for half duplex communication, as taught by Ehrenberger, in the system of Albert and Weinberger.

The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the main controller to ensure that data was received correctly by the placard (Ehrenberger; col. 5, lines 39-45).

With respect to claim 16, Albert, Weinberger and Ehrenberger disclose, the placard according to claim 15 (see above).

Ehrenberger further discloses, wherein the signal is acknowledged by the transponder after the electronic updateable display has displayed the customer specific message (note the order of 425 and 440 in fig. 4; also note col. 7, lines 58-62).

With respect to claim 24, Albert discloses, a system comprising:

one or more antennas (note the antenna above the transmitter in fig. 6a);

a transmitter coupled to the one or more antennas for transmitting a signal (370 in fig. 6a), said signal comprising a first portion for identification and a second portion for a first customer specific message (col. 19, lines 56-58; col. 14, lines 33-41; clearly demonstrate that Albert includes identification data along with a customer specific message in the data transmitted to the placard); and

a plurality of placards (col. 14, lines 60-64), wherein each placard comprises a receiver having a memory (360 in fig. 6a) storing an identification code (col. 14, lines 33-36) and an antenna (302 in fig. 6a) for receiving; a capacitor coupled to the transponder (320 in fig. 6a; col. 14, lines 21-24); and an electronic updateable static

display (350 in fig. 6a; col. 14, lines 42-47) coupled to the transponder and powered by the capacitor for displaying said first customer specific message and any subsequent messages when said first portion of the signal matches the identification code of the device (col. 14, lines 37-41), whereby the capacitor is capable of being charged by the signal (col. 14, lines 10-17 for example).

Albert does not expressly disclose that an acknowledgement signal is sent by a transponder in the placard, or that such a signal is received by a transceiver. Additionally Albert fails to expressly disclose at least one coupler connected to an in-flight entertainment system for receiving a second customer specific message.

Weinberger discloses, an airline passenger entertainment system (fig. 1 for example), receiving a second customer specific message (clear from figs. 1-7) from at least one coupler (235 in fig. 7 for example) connected to at least one member selected from the group comprising an in-flight entertainment system (268 in fig. 5; for example) for receiving a second customer specific message therefrom (clear from figs. 1-7); wherein a receiver (272 in fig. 7 for example) and the entertainment system (268 in fig. 5) are coupled to said at least one coupler.

Albert and Weinberger are analogous art because they are both from the same field of endeavor namely, air travel related display systems (Albert; col. 14, lines 60-61).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the entertainment system coupler of Weinberger in the displays of Albert.

The motivation for doing so would have been to efficiently allow for higher bandwidth applications of the displays, such as teleconferencing or video download (Weinberger; col. 16, lines 5-14).

Ehrenberger discloses, a digital radio transmission system comprising, a transceiver (212 in fig. 2) that both sends and receives signal via an antenna (note the antenna attached to the transceiver in fig. 2) to a plurality of HOT units (132 in fig. 2). The HOT units are further capable of acknowledging a signal (440 in fig. 4) by responding to the 212-transceiver using the transceiver of the HOT unit.

Ehrenberger, Weinberger and Albert are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor namely display systems receiving display data via radio communications.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include transceiver circuitry for half duplex communication, as taught by Ehrenberger, in the system of Albert and Weinberger.

The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the main controller to ensure that data was received correctly by the placard (Ehrenberger; col. 5, lines 39-45).

With respect to claim 25, Albert, Weinberger and Ehrenberger disclose, the system of claim 24 (see above).

Ehrenberger further discloses, wherein the signal is acknowledged after the electronic updateable display has displayed the customer specific message (note the order of 425 and 440 in fig. 4; also note col. 7, lines 58-62).

With respect to claim 26, Albert, Weinberger and Ehrenberger disclose, the system of claim 25 (see above).

Albert further discloses, wherein the signal comprises one or more identification codes, each identification code being associated with one of the plurality of placards (col. 14, lines 33-36), each identification code having associated with it a customer specific message (col. 14, lines 37-41; the customer specific message being the data stream that is attached to (i.e. "associated with") the id code data).

Ehrenberger further discloses, a controller (204 in fig. 2) coupled to the transmitter (212 in fig. 2) for generating a signal.

With respect to claims 28-31, Albert, Weinberger and Ehrenberger disclose, the system of claim 26 (see above).

Neither Albert nor Ehrenberger expressly disclose associating the display with a plurality of seating positions; and wherein each display is coupled to a seat.

Weinberger further discloses, associating the display with a plurality of seating positions; and wherein each display is coupled to a seat (col. 6, lines 52-55; for example).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to locate the displays of Albert and Matsuzaki at a seat back as taught by Weinberger. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow each individual passenger to interface with the system (Weinberger; col. 6, lines 54-55).

With respect to claim 33, Albert and Weinberger disclose, the method of using the system according to claim 32 (see above).

Neither Albert nor Weinberger expressly disclose, transmitting a return signal indicative of the electronic updateable static display having been set with the transmitted message.

Ehrenberger discloses, a digital radio transmission system comprising, a transceiver (212 in fig. 2) that both sends and receives signal via an antenna (note the antenna attached to the transceiver in fig. 2) to a plurality of HOT units (132 in fig. 2). The HOT units acknowledge the correct display of a received signal (440 in fig. 4) by responding to the 212-transceiver using the transceiver of the HOT unit (note the order of 425 and 440 in fig. 4; also note col. 7, lines 58-62).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include transceiver circuitry for half duplex communication, as taught by Ehrenberger, in the system of Albert and Weinberger.

The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the main controller to ensure that data was received correctly by the placard (Ehrenberger; col. 5, lines 39-45).

13. Claims 19 and 36-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Albert et al. (US 6,118,426) in view of Weinberger et al. (US 7,028,304) and further in view of Isomichi et al. (US 6,633,225).

With respect to claim 19, Albert and Weinberger disclose, the system according to claim 18 (see above).

Neither Albert nor Weinberger expressly disclose, wherein the customer specific message displayed on the electronic updateable static display comprises a seat identification and a user selected name.

Isomichi discloses, an airline passenger paging system comprising a plurality of wireless addressed a/v units (1 in fig. 1), each of which displays a passenger's name, flight number, and seat number (col. 5, lines 1-4).

Isomichi, Weinberger and Albert are analogous art because they are both from the same field of endeavor namely individually addressable display devices that are updated via radio communication.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the placards of Albert as airline passenger pagers, as taught by Isomichi.

The motivation for doing so would have been, to inform airline passengers of boarding time and location (Isomichi; col. 1, lines 58-60).

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Isomichi with Albert for the benefit of informing specific airline passengers of boarding times and locations to obtain the invention as specified in claim 19.

With respect to claim 36, Albert and Weinberger disclose, the method of using the system according to claim 32 (see above).

Neither Albert nor Weinberger expressly disclose, wherein the signal having a customer specific message is associated with a reserved seat for a specified customer.

Isomichi discloses, a plurality of pagers which retrieve customer specific messages that are associated with a reserved seat for a specified customer (col. 5, lines 1-2, 11-13).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to retrieve customer specific messages, for the displays of Albert and Weinberger, that are associated with a reserved seat for a specified customer, as taught by Isomichi.

The motivation for doing so would have been, to individually inform airline passengers of boarding time and location (Isomichi; col. 1, lines 58-60; also see col. 4, lines 51-58).

With respect to claim 37, Albert and Weinberger disclose, the method of using the system according to claim 32 (see above).

Albert further discloses, using the radio signs in airports and train stations (col. 14, lines 60-61).

Neither Albert nor Weinberger expressly disclose, retrieving the customer specific message from an airline reservation or boarding system.

Isomichi discloses, a plurality of pagers which retrieve customer specific messages from an airline reservation or boarding system (col. 4, lines 35-50).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to retrieve customer specific messages for the displays of Albert and Weinberger from an airline system as taught by Isomichi.

The motivation for doing so would have been, to inform airline passengers of boarding time and location (Isomichi; col. 1, lines 58-60).

14. Claims 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Albert et al. (US 6,118,426) in view of Weinberger et al. (US 7,028,304) and further in view of Matsuzaki et al. (US 4,896,209).

With respect to claim 20, Albert and Weinberger disclose, the system according to claim 18 (see above).

Neither Albert nor Weinberger expressly disclose, wherein each of the plurality of placards are visibly locatable and associable with a plurality of seating positions.

Matsuzaki discloses, a passenger vehicle polling system wherein each of a plurality of a/v units (each 35 in fig. 3) that are visibly locatable (clear from fig. 3) and associable with a plurality of seating positions (clear from fig. 7).

Matsuzaki, Weinberger and Albert are analogous art because they are both from the same field of endeavor namely, wireless transmission of display signals to a plurality of displays.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to place the placards of Albert and Weinberger in visibly locatable positions as well as associable with a plurality of seating positions, as taught by Matsuzaki.

The motivation for doing so would have been, to entertain passengers during long duration flights (Matsuzaki; col. 1, lines 15-18).

With respect to claim 21, Albert, Weinberger and Matsuzaki disclose, the system according to claim 20 (see above).

Matsuzaki further discloses, wherein each device is coupled to a seat (clear from fig. 3).

With respect to claim 22, Albert and Weinberger disclose, the system according to claim 18 (see above).

Neither Albert nor Weinberger expressly disclose, wherein each of the plurality of placards are visibly locatable and associable with a plurality of seating positions.

Matsuzaki discloses, a passenger vehicle polling system wherein each of a plurality of a/v units (35 in fig. 3) that are visibly locatable (clear from fig. 3) and associable with a plurality of seating positions (clear from fig. 7).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to place the placards of Albert and Weinberger in visibly locatable positions as well as associable with a plurality of seating positions, as taught by Matsuzaki.

The motivation for doing so would have been, to entertain passengers during long duration flights (Matsuzaki; col. 1, lines 15-18).

With respect to claim 23, Albert, Weinberger and Matsuzaki disclose, the system according to claim 22 (see above).

Matsuzaki further discloses, wherein each device is coupled to a seat (clear from fig. 3).

15. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Albert et al. (US 6,118,426) in view of Weinberger et al. (US 7,028,304) and Ehrenberger et al. (US 5,785,283) and further in view of Isomichi et al. (US 6,633,225).

With respect to claim 27, Albert, Weinberger and Ehrenberger disclose, the system of claim 26 (see above).

Neither Ehrenberger, Weinberger nor Albert expressly disclose, wherein the customer specific message displayed on the electronic updateable static display comprises a seat identification and a user selected name.

Isomichi discloses, an airline passenger paging system comprising a plurality of wireless addressed a/v units (1 in fig. 1), each of which displays a passenger's name, flight number, and seat number (col. 5, lines 1-4).

Isomichi, Ehrenberger, Weinberger and Albert are analogous art because they are both from the same field of endeavor namely, transmission of display signals to a plurality of individually addressable displays.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the placards of Albert, Weinberger and Ehrenberger as airline passenger pagers, as taught by Isomichi.

The motivation for doing so would have been, to inform airline passengers of boarding time and location (Isomichi; col. 1, lines 58-60).

16. Claims 34-35 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Albert et al. (US 6,118,426) in view of Weinberger et al. (US 7,028,304) and further in view of Briechle et al. (US 5,977,998).

With respect to claim 34, Albert and Weinberger disclose, the method of using the system according to claim 32 (see above).

Albert further discloses, receiving a stream of messages, with information as to how to transition between the messages (col. 19, lines 51-55), and displaying an updated message when a timer expires (for example see col. 7, lines 47-58) and displaying updated messaged by using energy from the capacitor or from a backup power source (col. 14, lines 64-66).

Neither Weinberger nor Albert expressly disclose, waiting for a specified period by using a timer coupled to a memory that is started upon the action of displaying the customer specific message on the electronic updateable static display.

Briechle discloses, waiting for a specified period (dwell time; fig. 12) by using a timer (69 in fig. 6; LCD driver is supplied the data registers, and as such decodes the time between display updating; col. 8, lines 38-43) coupled to a message memory (70 in fig. 6) that is started upon the action of displaying the customer specific message on the electronic updateable static display (clear from fig. 16).

Briechle, Weinberger and Albert are analogous art because they are both from the same field of endeavor namely, an extensive network of individually addressable displays that are updateable.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the timing circuitry of Briechle in the displays of Albert and Weinberger.

The motivation for doing so would have been, to allow the display of a string of characters that might be too large for a single screen (Briechle; col. 1, lines 36-40).

With respect to claim 35, Albert, Weinberger and Briechle disclose, the method of using the system according to claim 34 (see above).

Albert further discloses, wherein the backup power source is a battery or a solar cell coupled to the display (col. 14, lines 65-66).

With respect to claim 38, Albert, Weinberger and Briechle disclose, the method of using the system according to claim 34 (see above).

Albert further discloses, receiving and storing retrieved messages in a message memory (col. 17, lines 17-20).

Weinberger further discloses, retrieving and storing messages from an In-Flight Entertainment system in a message memory (col. 20, lines 41-45).

Conclusion

17. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William L. Boddie whose telephone number is (571) 272-0666. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 7:30 - 4:30 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sumati Lefkowitz can be reached on (571) 272-3638. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Wlb
5/1/07

SUMATI LEFKOWITZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER